



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,502	07/07/2003	Larry F. Rhodes	203PR07071-US-CIP2	9266

7590 11/12/2004  
HUDAK, SHUNK & FARINE CO. LPA  
Suite 307  
2020 Front Street  
Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44221

EXAMINER  
ZALUKAEVA, TATYANA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1713	

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/614,502

Applicant(s)

RHODES ET AL.

Examiner

Tatyana Zalukaeva

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/09/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

This application repeats a substantial portion of prior Application No. 09/930,197 (now U.S. Patent 6,593,440), filed 08/16/2001, and adds and claims additional disclosure not presented in the prior application. Since the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 120 are not met, then the claim for benefit of the earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as a continuation-in-part are denied. A later filed application 10/614,502 that changes the disclosure in a prior application does not satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, under 35 U.S.C. 120 and is not entitled to benefit of the earlier filing date. In addition, where an application is found to be fatally defective under 35 U.S.C. 112 because of an inadequate disclosure to support an allowable claim, a second design patent application filed as an alleged "continuation-in-part" of the first application to supply the deficiency is not entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date. See *Hunt Co. v. Mallinckrodt Chemical Works*, 177 F.2d 583, 83 USPQ 277 (Fed. Cir. 1949). However, unless the filing date of the earlier application is actually needed, such as to avoid intervening prior art, the entitlement to priority in this CIP application will not be considered. See *In re Corba*, 212 USPQ 825 (Comm'r Pat. 1981). Therefore the earliest filing date for the instant **Application is 07/07/2003.**

***Grouping of Claims***

2. Applicants are advised that at the present time claims drawn to a composition, to a method of forming a composition and to a method of forming a patterned structure are examined together. However, if further amended claims may be subjected to a restriction/election of species requirement at any later stage of the prosecution.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***


3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaimoto et al (U.S. 5,585,219)

Kaimoto discloses resist composition and a process for forming a resist pattern using a resist composition are disclosed. The present composition includes 100 parts by weight of a copolymer of a 2-norbornene-2-substituent unit and an acrylic acid ester unit of the formula below wherein, X is a cyano or chloro group, R is tert-butyl, dimethylbenzyl, or tetrahydropyranyl, m is an integer of 9 to 2390, and n is an integer of 21 to 5180, and 1 to 20 parts by weight of a photo acid generator (PAG). A finely-resolved resist pattern with high sensitivity and good dry etch resistance is obtained by the present composition and present process for forming the resist pattern (see abstract).



Synthetic Example 1 (Synthesis of copolymer of 2-norbornene-2-carbonitrile and methacrylic acid tetrahydropyranyl ester) 5.0 g (41.6 m mol) of 2-norbornene-2-carbonitrile, 4.72 g (27.7 m mole) of methacrylic acid tetrahydropyranyl ester and 13.9 ml of tetrahydrofuran (fully dried) (in short THF) were charged into 100 ml of the three-necked flask equipped with a magnetic stirring bar coated with a fluorine polymer (Teflon, which is a registered mark), followed by stirring at -17.degree. C. for ten minutes under a nitrogen atmosphere. To this solution, 311 mg (2.8 m mol, 4 mol %) of potassium tert-butoxide was dissolved and 4 ml of dry THF was slowly added. This example provides for the ratio of norbornene unit to methacrylate unit as per claim 1. See also synthetic example 2 in col. 6 and 7. The photoresist composition is described in Example 1, col.7, lines 50-55 and comprises above described copolymer having acid liable groups, PAG and solvent, the method of its forming is also described in this example, as well as in examples 2 and 3 in col.8

The above disclosure meets the limitations of the instant claims 1-3, 8, 9.

With regard to the method of forming patterned structure, see Examples 1, col.7, lines 60-65, col.8, lines 1-15, 29-40, and general description in col.2, lines 20-67. This reads

Art Unit: 1713

on the limitations of claims 13, 14, 16. The resist coatings of Kaimoto were subjected to dry etching by CF<sub>4</sub>/O<sub>2</sub>. This is a reactive ion etching that is recited in the instant claim 15.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1713

8. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaimoto in view of Sen et al (U.S. 6,111,041) . The steps and the components of the process of claims 8 and 9 are met by Kaimoto, as discussed above. Kaimoto does not teach the preparation of polymer using Pd catalyst. Sen discloses production of norbornene-acrylate copolymers using Pd catalyst, wherein the comonomers are identical to those of Kaimoto, and the motivation is made to utilize the type of catalyst that realizes the advantages of both types of monomers, i.e. acrylates and norbornenes. Therefore, based on the substantial identity of both polymerization systems of Kaimoto and Sen it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize known catalytic system for known polymers in order to vary and optimize the ratios of acrylate/norbornene in resulting polymers and thus to arrive at the instant claims 10 and 11 .


9. Claims 4-7, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaimoto in view of Rhodes et al (U.S. 6,232,417).

With regard to claim 4 Kaimoto does not disclose the presence of one of dissolution rate modifier, quencher or sensitizer. Photoresist compositions of Kaimoto and Rhodes contain the same basic units of norbornene and norbornene derivatives as monomers, and thus utilize the advantages of norbornenes, such as good dry etch resistance and at the same time having good transparency. The photoresist compositions of Rhodes invention contain a sensitizer capable of sensitizing the photoacid initiator to longer wave lengths ranging from mid UV to visible light. Depending on the intended application, such sensitizers include polycyclic aromatics such as pyrene and


Art Unit: 1713

perlene. Rhodes further emphasizes that the sensitization of photoacid initiators is well-known and is described in numerous patents. It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to utilize the sensitizer, as suggested by Rhodes in the composition of Kaimoto in order to sensitize the photoacid initiator to longer wave lengths ranging from mid UV to visible light.

With regard to claims 5-7 and 12, the disclosure of Kaimoto differs from the instant claims by not disclosing the use of more than one of either monomer: norbornene or acrylate. Rhodes discloses a photoresist composition comprising a photoresist copolymer photoacid generator and organic solvent. Imageable radiation-sensitive resist composition is disclosed comprising an acid-generating initiator and a polycyclic polymer containing recurring acid labile pendant groups along the polymer backbone. Preferred monomers are shown in col.5, lines 45-50



or in col.8, lines 30-40



The photoresist compositions of Rhodes incorporate MORE than one norbornene derivative as a comonomer, as seen from numerous examples, such as 27-32, col.63,



64, etc., 41, 42 in col. 67. Based on the similarity of photoresist compositions of Rhodes and Kaimioto, it would have been obvious to employ more than one norbornene derivative as a monomer unit in order to achieve better balance between the dry etch resistance, UV light absorbance and transparency and thus to arrive at the instantly claimed subject matter.

10. Other prior art references cited in PTOL show the state of the art in photoresist compositions that employ norbornene (co)polymers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tatyana Zalukaeva whose telephone number is (571) 272-1115. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tatyana Zalukaeva  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1713



Application/Control Number: 10/614,502  
Art Unit: 1713

Page 9

November 9, 2004